THE CHARLES F. ADAMS PLATFORM,

OR

A LOOKING GLASS FOR THE WORTHIES OF THE BUFFALO CONVENTION.

The business of constructing political platforms would seem to have become a common, if not an essential, part of every Presidential canvass. Sometimes they are resorted to merely to cloak the sinister designs and purposes of such as are bent on the realization of selfish objects, and are intended to amuse, deceive, and hoodwink the people. Bold and shameless professions of respect for, and attachment to, the masses, and impudent pretensions to exclusive Democracy, mixed up with false assumptions, unmeaning generalities, and imputations on the conduct and motives of others, alike ungenerous and false, constitute the sum and substance of what, in modern times, is facetiously called a *Democratic* platform. Of this the Baltimore resolutions of 1844, revamped in 1848, (discreetly omitting all that was said at the first date about our "title to the whole of Oregon" as being "clear and unquestionable,") constitute the best example which the history of the country affords. Humbug is inscribed on the face of every such platform in characters so legible that "he who runs may read." But there is another kind of platform, which is entitled to a widely different consideration, and consists in developing the motives, principles, purposes, designs, and conduct of men, whether good, bad, or indifferent, faithfully and fully, so as to place them, as it were, on a pedestal or platform, in presence of the people, whose searching eyes will soon enable them to collect all the materials essential to a just and proper estimate of character. Thus, if Gen. Zachary Taylor were to be brought on to such a platform, it would soon be seen that the greatest sincerity, truth, moderation, prudence, firmness, humanity, love of justice, and devotion to his country, have ever marked his course, and that every pulsation of his noble heart beats in unison with the aspirations and desires of a plain, honest, and truly republican people. Wherever the true glory and best interests of our country are to be found, there we shall be sure to discover the platform of Zachary Taylor. But if we are to have platforms for the great, good, virtuous, and wise—for those who have been the benefactors of the Republic, and who are the honor of the age in which they live, so also there must be a bad eminence, or platform, on which we may exhibit to the scorn and derision of mankind the base, selfish, intriguing, and unprincipled, who consider politics a mere game, and take a part in public affairs only to deceive and betray. In this sense we have submitted to the public a Cass platform and a Van Buren platform, displaying the merits of two of the candidates for the Presidency, and their claims to public confidence in their true light, wherein we have "naught extenuated nor set down aught in malice." Of Gen. Cass it is enough to observe, that his merits can only be properly expressed by an INVENTORY OF HIS LIVES, HIS FACES, HIS SALARIES, AND HIS RATIONS—all multifarious, and "name legion," with an immense estate as the result; to constitute which the Treasury has been made to bleed at every pore. But what shall we say of "the great Magician"—"the northern man with southern principles"—the man who transferred the spoils system from Albany to Washington, and thus introduced the most inveterate evils into our political Eden, and who is more entirely responsible for all that has been corrupt and demoralizing in the politics of the country, and all that has been wild, visionary, and mischievous in our national policy, than any, and indeed all, others who have figured on the theatre of public life for the last quarter of a century; and who, to gain the Presidency, threw himself on the platform of profound subserviency to the South, bowing and cringing to the slave power for a long course of years—offering up the right of petition, freedom of speech and of the press, and the inviolability of the mails, as sacrifices to propitiate southern prejudices and to win southern support, until his hopes were realized, and he became, in an evil hour, the Chief Magistrate of these United States. But his ambition was not yet satiated; he craved a re-election to the Presidency, and therefore he continued to exhibit himself in this degrading attitude until he was spurned by the people in 1840, and repudiated by his political friends in 1844, but at length discovered that HIS DOUGH-FACE PLATFORM will no longer answer his purpose, and then he suddenly takes a leap in the direction of northern rights and northern interests; when lo! MARTIN VAN BUREN PERCHES HIMSELF ON THE PLATFORM OF FREE SOIL. It is done quick as a flash! One moment he is here! Next there! First, and a long time, wholly for the South; and now a little for the North; when, to the astonishment of all, we are called to witness THE UNION OF THE HOUSES OF LINDENWALD AND BRAINTREE—*a marriage extraordinary between all that is superlative and rampant in modern Democracy, and all that is cold, selfish, austere, and vinegar-like, in the remains of American aristocracy, dying out and tapering off in the third generation.* Under such circumstances it would seem to be proper to present to the public A CHARLES F. ADAMS PLATFORM, which shall be as follows:

A SKETCH OF THE POLITICAL CHARACTER OF THE HON. MARTIN VAN BUREN, AS DRAWN TO THE LIFE, BY CHARLES F. ADAMS, ESQ., BEING AN EXTRACT FROM A PAMPHLET PUBLISHED BY THE SAID ADAMS IN APRIL, 1844:

"He (Mr. Van Buren) has, through his friends, *bargained away* much that the free States deem valuable: The right of petition—the protection of home industry—the freedom of speech, and indeed almost every other security to liberty, for the sake of assuring himself of the support of the southern States. We know the calculating policy of that gentleman. The principles of liberty are never safe in the hands of men who make a trade of public affairs. Mr. Van Buren *must be judged by his preceding course, taken as a whole;* and, from that, let no man delude himself with the belief that HE IS FIXED IN ANY THING BUT HIS OWN INTEREST."

A WONDERFUL COINCIDENCE BETWEEN THE ABOVE AND THE VIEWS OF THE HON. JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS OF THE POLITICAL CHARACTER OF MR. VAN BUREN, AS WILL APPEAR FROM AN EXTRACT

J. & G. S. Gideon, Printers.

FROM A SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. G. A FEW YEARS SINCE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"I may be led to confide in *the honor* of a slaveholder, but A SERVILE DOUGH-FACE is too destitute of that article to obtain credit with me. Mr. Van Buren has placed *the evidence of his servility* conspicuously on the records of our country. There it will remain, and be regarded as an *enduring memento of the degeneracy of the man* who filled our public stations."

"Although a northern man, it became the boast of his friends that he possessed southern principles, and he soon gave *satisfactory evidence* of his devotion to the interests of his employers, (slave merchants.) Indeed, *had he been bred up in the business*, he would scarcely have discovered *more attachment to the interests of the slave-growers and slave-dealers.*"

* * * * * "*Anxiety for the success of that 'execrable commerce'* appears to have been *uppermost in his mind, and to have superseded all other matters of State policy.*"

HOW CHARLES F. ADAMS, ESQ., ENDEAVORS TO SQUIRM OUT OF HIS FAITHFUL PORTRAITURE OF THE POLITICAL CHARACTER OF MR. VAN BUREN.

"QUINCY, 6th Sept., 1848.

"*To the Editor of the Boston Republican:*

"DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the fact, that Hon. George Ashmun, on Friday last, quoted certain passages of a production of mine, long since written, expressive of entire want of confidence in the character of Mr. Van Buren. The use attempted now to be made of them renders a few words of explanation absolutely necessary, in justice to the gentleman attacked through me.

"The pamphlet from which the passages are taken was a very humble endeavor on my part to rouse the sluggish feelings of the people of the free States against the slaveholding plot of the annexation of Texas. It was written *prior* to the nomination of the candidates for the Presidency by the respective parties, and with the hope of prompting a popular demand that they should be committed against that measure. At the moment, Mr. Van Buren was generally regarded as the most likely to obtain the Democratic nomination, and it was very much apprehended by me, that notwithstanding his known resistance to the annexation, while President, as I knew he would find it impossible to secure the nomination without agreeing to it, he would sacrifice his own views, and the cause of Freedom, to this new demand of the slave-power.

"'Up to this moment, which was in April, 1844, the opinions which I formed of Mr. Van Buren, and which I expressed in this pamphlet, were honestly and openly held by me. I expected that he would sacrifice the free States to the selfish purpose of securing his own interest, and thus gain the Presidency again. This expectation dictated the passages which have been quoted by Mr. Ashmun. I fully believed that what I said was true. But great indeed was my surprise to find in May that I had been entirely mistaken. Instead of sacrificing his opinions, Mr. Van Buren wrote the letter to Mr. Hammett of Mississippi, which sustained his former opposition to the annexation of Texas. And this letter in my belief, then, as well as now, cost him the nomination. Instead, therefore, of verifying my fear that he would be 'true to his own interest only,' I found that he had done what so sagacious a Statesman could not help knowing would prove, as it did prove, fatal to it. He did what Mr. Leavitt lately said of him, and what no other man in the United States has done, 'laid the Presidency upon the altar, with his eyes open.'

"I need not say that my opinion of Mr. Van Buren was changed from that day, and throughout the canvass of 1844, as well as since. Wherever I addressed my fellow-citizens, I took occasion to enlarge upon this fact to the honor of that gentleman. For much as I still disapproved of many of his former acts, I became convinced that there was a point beyond which he would not go, and that point had been reached in the case of Texas. Since that time I have watched his course with anxiety, and not without apprehension and occasional fluctuations of opinion, until the meeting of the Buffalo Convention. And the result of all my observation is, that he seems to me to have done more to concentrate and rally the friends of Liberty of all parties in the free States, than all the leading members put together of the late Whig party, who now, by way of proving their zeal against the extension of slavery, advocate the claims to the Presidency of the only slaveholder in the field.

"Thus much I have felt it due to Mr. Van Buren to say, in reparation of the injustice I did him in 1844. He entirely falsified my prediction of what his course would be. Whenever any one of my late Whig friends will make me err on the same side, by *doing* more for the cause of Liberty than his previous professions have led me to anticipate, I shall stand equally ready to do him the same justice. I am, very respectfully,

"CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS."

HOW CHARLES F. ADAMS, ESQ., IS UTTERLY MISTAKEN IN ONE OF THE GROUNDS AT LEAST, ON WHICH THE AFORESAID SQUIRM IS ATTEMPTED.

Mr. Adams tells us he had a very bad opinion of Mr. V. B. in April, 1844; he says "that opinion was honestly and openly held by me." "But great indeed was my surprise to find, in May, that I had been entirely mistaken. Mr. Van Buren wrote the letter to Mr. Hammett, of Mississippi, which sustained his former opposition to the annexation of Texas." Now, it so happens, that Mr. Van Buren's letter to Mr. Hammett is dated at Lindenwald on the 20th of April, 1844, was published in the Washington Globe on the 27th, and must have reached Boston before the expiration of the month. From the language used by Mr. Adams as above it would seem that he must have had some knowledge of the Hammett letter, or of some thing new in the course of Mr. Van Buren, when he wrote his pamphlet, for he says that gentleman "*must be judged by his preceding course taken as a whole.*" Why should Mr. A. insist so emphatically on judging Mr. V. B. on the totality of his life and conduct, unless there had been some modification of it? If it had been his purpose to warn the public against coming to any conclusion favorable to Mr. V. B. on the Hammett letter only, and to urge the necessity of bringing into view his whole life, in order to form a proper estimate of his character, we do not see how he could use language more appropriate than that quoted above. Having established the doctrine that "his course must be taken as a whole," and that the Hammett letter, and a long series of acts of servility to the South, must be grouped together and exhibited in one view, to enable us to see what Mr. V. B. really is, we would inevitably conclude, as Mr. A. did, that "he is not fixed in any thing but his own interest."

It is possible, however, that the lucubrations of Mr. Adams may have seen the light before the appearance of Mr. Van Buren's letter in Boston; but Mr. A. will not deny but that nearly the entire edition of his work was disposed of after that event. Why, then, did he continue to disseminate imputations of the gravest character against Mr. V. B. after he knew they were groundless and false? Why did he not suppress the pamphlet, or at least endeavor to counteract through the public press the injustice he had unwittingly done a man who had occupied the exalted position of President of the United States? The suggestions made by Mr. Adams, at this late day, look very much like an after-thought.

How Mr. Van Buren enacted the magician in concocting his celebrated letter to Mr. Hammett of the 20th of April, 1844, and how curious it is that such a letter should have produced so wonderful an effect on the mind of Chas. F. Adams, esq.

On the 27th of March, 1844, the Hon. W. H. Hammett, then a member of Congress from Mississippi, addressed a letter to Mr. Van Buren, and remarked, that he was desirous of ascertaining his views on the subject of the immediate annexation of Texas to the United States, with the assent, of course, of that Republic, and requested him to express his opinions on both the constitutionality and the expediency of the measure. One would suppose that he might have responded to so plain an inquiry in a very few words. Are you in favor of the immediate annexation of Texas? Is the measure constitutional? Is it expedient? We cannot see what fair purpose there could have been to induce Mr. Van Buren to go beyond a categorical answer to these questions, and we submit that a few direct and frank expressions were all that was demanded by the occasion. The answer of Mr. Van Buren is now before us, and fills, with small and well packed type, not less than six columns and a half of the Washington Globe!!! And its very prolixity is such as to preclude ninety-nine out of a hundred of the electors of the country from ever acquiring any knowledge of its contents, except at second hand. None of the country papers could have republished it, and few readers even of the larger papers in which it appeared could have ventured on the desperate experiment of wading through such an array of useless verbiage. No man in this country ever understood as well as Mr. Van Buren does the art of using words in such manner as to conceal his real purposes or thoughts. But Mr. Adams, after stigmatizing Mr. Van Buren in April, as not "fixed to any thing but his own interests," says he was "surprised to find in May that he had been entirely mistaken." A revelation made, according to his own account of the matter, by the appearance of the Hammett letter. Hence it becomes important to inquire, what that letter really is?—which we shall briefly show, and the more readily as it will serve to illustrate the sincerity and honesty of both Mr. Van Buren and Mr. C. F. Adams. The following considerations will, it is believed, comprise all that is essential to a proper appreciation of the subject.

1. Not one word is to be found in the six and one half ponderous columns of the V. B. letter of objection to the annexation of Texas on anti-slavery grounds. Not the hint of an idea is to be seen any where that the measure would disturb the balance of power betwen the different sections of the Union, or would do injustice to the free States.

2. To the inquiry, whether the annexation of Texas would be constitutional, he replies, decidedly, in the affirmative, and not only so, he goes into a long argument to prove it. He quotes the Constitution as follows: "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union," refers to the acquisition of Florida and Louisiana, and finally concludes that it is in the power of this Government not merely to purchase territory of a foreign and independent Government or State, but to admit any such State at any time into our Union by a mere majority vote of the two Houses of Congress. Will Mr. Adams say whether such a monstrous doctrine contributed to change his opinions of Mr. Van Buren? Recollect that the Texas iniquity was consummated on this principle, and that the measure was carried by a majority vote of the two Houses, so that the accidental ascendancy of any faction in Congress may introduce into our confederacy any outlandish nation on earth contrary to the wishes of an immense majority of the people and of the States; and, yet, this is the doctrine of Mr. Van Buren, and which Mr. Adams seems now to sanction; for, he says, from the day it was promulgated his "opinion of Mr. Van Buren was changed."

3. It is true that Mr. Van Buren did, in the letter under consideration, object to the annexation of Texas on the ground of expediency, but it was solely on considerations derived from the relations then existing between Texas and Mexico, and between the United States and Mexico. He objected not so much to ultimate annexation as to immediate annexation; for he insisted that the relations of the U. S. and Mexico were those of amity, friendship, and good understanding; while the relations of Mexico and Texas were those of war and uncompromising hostility; and that it would be utterly impossible for us to acquire Texas without making ourselves a party to the war. Mr. Van Buren goes into a long detail to show that Mexico and Texas were then truly, and in fact, at war, and concludes, very properly, that for us to absorb one of the belligerents would be unprecedented in the history of nations, and would compromit alike the peace, honor, and interests of the country. So far Mr. Van Buren did well.

4. But we are sorry he did not do better—that he did not rise to the true level of enlightened and patriotic statesmanship—that he did not object to the measure then and always as dangerous to the harmony of the Union, and as unjust to the free States. It would seem that he might have referred to those provisions of the Constitution, usually denominated its compromises, and have dwelt at least for a brief space on the enormous advantages thus obtained by one part of the Union over the other, particularly in the matter of slave representation, and the injustice of aggravating those advantages by the annexation of additional slave territory. He had an admirable opportunity to put forth what he now pretends to favor, THE DOCTRINE OF FREE-SOIL, and to insist on the broad principle that whatever territory might thereafter be acquired *should be free*. But, not so; with all the art of his magical character, and the adroitness of a political chequer player, he put forward the word *now*. I object, he says, to annexation *now*, for the reason that war is at this time flagrant between Texas and Mexico, *but for the great principles of liberty and free-soil, and for the honor of our free institutions, in danger of being*

outraged by an extension of the area of African bondage, he had not one poor word to spare.

5. So far from it, he more than intimated that under circumstances likely to arise he would be in favor of annexation. He, in substance, avowed himself an ultimate annexationist! That it may appear that I do no injustice to Mr. Van Buren, I quote the subjoined extracts from the concluding part of his letter:

"The present condition of the relations between Mexico and Texas may soon be so far changed as to weaken, and perhaps to obviate entirely the objections against the immediate annexation of the latter to the United States, which I have here set forth, and to place the question on different grounds. Should such a state of things arise, and I be found in charge of the responsible duties of President, you may be assured I would meet the question thus presented to me with a sincere desire to promote the result which I believed best calculated to advance the permanent welfare of the whole country. In the discharge of this, the common duty of all our public functionaries, I would not allow myself to be influenced by local or sectional feelings. I am not, I need hardly say to you, an untried man, in respect to my disposition or ability to disregard any feeling of that character in the discharge of official duties. You, as well as others, have, therefore, at least some grounds on which to form an opinion as to the probable fidelity with which those assurances would be observed."

"I shall add a few words on another aspect of the question, and then dismiss the subject. Mexico may carry her persistance in refusing to acknowledge the independence of Texas, and in destructive but fruitless efforts to reconquer that State, so far as to produce, in connexion with other circumstances, a decided conviction on the part of a majority of the people of the United States that the permanent welfare, if not absolute safety, of all, make it necessary that the proposed annexation be effected, be the consequences what they may. The question may be asked what, under such circumstances, would be the use which you would make of the Executive power if entrusted to your hands? Would it be wielded to carry into effect the ascertained wishes of the people? My reply to such a supposition is, that I can conceive of no public questions, in respect to which it is more eminently proper that the opinions and wishes of the people, and interests of the different States, should be consulted, and being ascertained treated with greater respect, than those which relate either to the admission of a new member into the Confederacy, or the acquisition of additional territory. With a view to such a result, and that if any application for annexation under such circumstances were to be made to me, I would feel it to be my duty to submit the same to Congress for a public expression of their opinion, as well upon the propriety of annexation as in regard to the terms on which it should take place. If, after the whole subject had been brought before the country and fully discussed, as it now will be, the Senate and House of Representatives—a large portion of the former, and the whole of the latter, having been chosen by the people after the question of annexation had been brought before the country for its maturer consideration—should express an opinion in favor of annexation, I would hold it to be my farther duty to employ the Executive power to carry into full and fair effect the wishes of a majority of the people of the existing States thus constitutionally and solemnly expressed."

From the above it is apparent, that the objections of Mr. Van Buren to the annexation of Texas were of a fleeting or temporary character; and by the avowals comprised in the above extract, taken in connexion with his argument in favor of the constitutionality of the measure, he pretty nearly surrenders the whole question. Observe that he says:

1. That the existing relations of Mexico and Texas may be changed, or in other words they may make peace with each other, and this "may weaken or obviate entirely the objections against the immediate annexation of the latter to the United States."

2. That Mexico may carry her persistance, in refusing to acknowledge the independence of Texas, and in destructive and fruitless efforts to reconquer that State, so far "as to convince the people of the United States that the proposed annexation should be effected, be the consequences what they may."

3. And, finally, that if any Congress thereafter elected should express an opinion in favor of annexation, he would "hold it to be his duty to employ the Executive power to carry into full effect the wishes of a majority of the people of the existing States thus constitutionally and solemnly expressed."

According to Mr. Van Buren, annexation was to be postponed for a time, perhaps until Mexico and Texas came to a good understanding with each other, and perhaps not. In any event, we should ultimately have annexation; for he pledges himself, under the circumstances alluded to in his letter, to refer the question to Congress, and there he knew a combination of the slave interest with northern dough-faces would be certain to obtain a majority; and a decision thus made he would feel bound, as he says, to employ the Executive power to carry into effect—calling it, as if in mockery, "the wishes of a majority of the people of the existing States constitutionally and solemnly expressed."

This is precisely the construction given to this letter by the sagacious and able editors of the Washington Globe, devoted friends of Mr. Van Buren, and advocates of the annexation of Texas. Thus, in their paper of May 1st, 1844, they say:

"Mr. Van Buren, in conformity with his conduct when Secretary of State under General Jackson, goes for annexation whenever it can be accomplished without war with Mexico—that is, whenever war between Mexico and Texas actually ceases, or whenever the Congress of the United States shall deem it necessary to the security of this country, with the consent of a majority of the people of the existing States." * * * "We are with Mr. Van Buren, then, in waiting for the events that will enable us to get Texas without going to war with Mexico. These events are near at hand; they are within the limits of the year. The armistice will expire this month. On its expiration, Mexico must either make peace or resume hostilities, and prosecute them in good earnest to a conclusion. The latter she cannot do, and a constructive war will not answer her purpose."

In their paper of May 3d, 1844, they say: "We ardently desire to see Texas associated with the Union, and we embrace the plan of Mr. Van Buren as the most practicable one to accomplish it. If Mr. Van Buren shall be re-elected to the Presidency, his term will not expire without seeing the annexation of Texas to the Union." * * * "If there is any shorter or safer way of bringing Texas into the Union than Mr. Van Buren's, (which requires only a *bare majority* of Congress to 'express an opinion in favor of annexation,') we should like to see it, or at least hear of it."

And then again, in their paper of May 6, 1844, they say "he" (Mr. Van Buren) "goes for admission under qualifications which make it absolutely certain the country will be recovered in a brief time, either this or the next year. Mr. Van Buren is, then, in our opinion, the person who ought to be

supported for the Presidency by every real friend to the recovery of Texas."

Thus we have proved, from Mr. Van Buren's letter, that he was an ultimate annexationist, and yet it is this letter which Mr. Adams would have us now believe converted him, from the worst possible opinion of Mr. Van Buren's rectitude and honor, to a highly favorable estimate of his character; though that conversion seems to have been *instantaneous*, for he says, after "that time," (meaning the appearance of the letter,) I have watched his course with anxiety, and not without apprehensions and occasional fluctuations of opinion, until the meeting of the Buffalo Convention." Then the good work was consummated, and Mr. Charles. F. Adams became a thoroughgoing Van Buren man. At what precise period of the deliberations of that august body the moral and political effulgence of Lindenwald burst upon his perplexed vision does not distinctly appear, though some will shrewdly suspect it was at the juncture when a certain "apostate and unnatural connexion" was formed in reference to the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

HOW THERE ARE SOME VERY UGLY CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE CAREER OF MR. VAN BUREN SUBSEQUENT TO THE HAMMETT LETTER, CONFLICTING WITH THE PRETENCE NOW SET UP BY MR. ADAMS, THAT "HIS OPINION OF MR. VAN BUREN WAS CHANGED FROM THE DATE OF SAID LETTER," AND THAT HE "BECAME CONVINCED THAT THERE WAS A POINT BEYOND WHICH HE WOULD NOT GO, AND THAT POINT HAD BEEN REACHED IN THE CASE OF TEXAS."

These circumstances are as follows:

1. He contributed most powerfully to the election of James K. Polk to the Presidency, and that, too, after the issue had been distinctly made up on the immediate annexation of Texas. Mr. Polk had, in advance of the Baltimore Convention, declared expressly for the policy of annexation; which measure, together with an assertion of our title to the whole of Oregon, constituted a prominent part of the political platform put forth by that body. We think we run no hazard in affirming that Mr. Adams, in his political addresses, (for it seems, according to his letter, that he took an active part in the canvass of '44,) opposed the election of Mr. P. on the ground that it would involve the admission of Texas into the Union, and that, in its turn, would involve us in a war with Mexico. Mr. Van Buren not only, as we have reason to believe, voted for Mr. Polk, but, during the canvass, wrote several letters, earnestly urging his friends every where, by their influence, exertions, and suffrages, to concur in elevating him to the Presidency. The late Silas Wright, the bosom friend of Mr. V. B., was induced to leave his seat in the Senate of the United States to become a candidate for the office of Governor of New York, with a view to throw all the weight of his name and character into the scale in favor of Mr. Polk, knowing that the general result would depend on the vote of that State.

The same thing was true in respect to all the personal and political friends of Mr. V. B. throughout the Empire State, and, indeed, throughout the nation—all worked incessantly, not only with the approbation, but at the earnest solicitation of Mr. V. B., for Polk—Texas—annexation—and war with Mexico. And this was done when Mr. V. B. well knew that a single word from him would put an extinguisher on the hopes of Mr. Polk for ever. Indeed, the nomination of Mr. P. at Baltimore was, it is believed, a mere Van Buren movement, made, it is true, after the nomination of Mr. V. B. had become unattainable by reason of the two-thirds rule, and with a view to checkmate and defeat those who had baulked the hopes of Mr. V. B. himself. There is hardly a man in this Republic who is more responsible for the election of Mr. Polk, and the annexation of Texas, than Martin Van Buren; and yet Mr. Adams tells us that the point beyond which he would not go "was reached in the case of Texas."

2. Mr. Van Buren's political friends in the two Houses of Congress have sustained the whole policy of the Administration, not only in relation to the annexation of Texas, but in relation to the late war with Mexico. Mr. Senator Dix voted for the annexation when he held the fate of that ill-omened measure in his hands, and no portion of the House has been more unscrupulous and determined in upholding Mr. Polk's schemes of war and conquest than have the Democratic members from the State of New York; and it is incredible that such of them as sympathize politically with Mr. Van Buren, should have done this without his full concurrence and approbation.

3. The mere silence of Mr. Van Buren, under such circumstances, would be sufficient to make him a *particeps criminis* in all the infamy of the Texas business. But he has not been silent. He spoke out, openly and boldly, in favor of the consummation of this measure of iniquity. Witness the following significant letter addressed by him in the fall of 1845 to a political friend of the city of New York:

"LINDENWALD, Sept. 2d, 1845.

"DEAR SIR: I have had the honor to receive your friendly letter, conveying to me, by its direction, the proceedings of a spontaneous meeting of the Democracy of the 10th and 13th wards of the city of New York.

"The just discrimination and patriotic ardor by which those proceedings are distinguished do honor to the meeting, and are in harmony with the invaluable principles and past lives of those who composed it. I have read them with great satisfaction, and do not in the least doubt that they speak also the sentiments of the Democracy of the whole city.

"Without a more particular notice of the contents of the resolutions, in respect to all of which my sentiments are well understood, I will content myself with a single remark upon one only of the points they embrace. It is well known that the preliminary steps taken by the late Administration for the annexation of Texas did not, under the then existing circumstances, meet with the approbation of portions of the Democratic party. Yet you are, in my judgment, quite right in assuming that that measure has been so far consummated, under the sanction of the constituted authorities of both Governments, as to render all farther agitation of the question, or obstacles to its amicable completion, by the citizens of either country, unwise and highly inexpedient. To refrain from such a course is not only in honorable consistency with the justice and sincerity of the dissenting opinions to which I have alluded, but, under the circumstances, the performance of a solemn duty on the part of those who held them. It can scarcely be necessary to enlarge upon the extent to which the imperative nature of that duty would be increased should our country be involved in a war with Mexico, in consequence of the adoption of authorized measures to carry into full and fair effect the compact of annexation. That no such consequence may follow is, for many reasons, to be most earnestly desired But, if the result be otherwise, I cannot permit myself to doubt that the Administration will, as it ought, be supported in the prosecution of such a war by the hearts and hands of the whole people.

"I am, dear sir, very respectfully and truly yours,

"Mr. JOHN D. KELLOGG." "M. VAN BUREN.

It will be recollected that, at the date of the foregoing letter, annexation had not, in point of fact,

been effected. At the close of the preceding session Congress had passed certain resolutions in the nature of a proposition to Texas for annexation, and Texas had, at a subsequent date, agreed to the proposition, and accepted the terms suggested by us. But, still, real annexation remained to be accomplished. Indeed, Mr. Van Buren himself, in the foregoing letter, speaks of all that had been done up to that date as "PRELIMINARY STEPS." Multitudes of the citizens of the free States, knowing that the deed was yet to be done, anticipating from the measure a long, bloody, and disastrous war, and considering it as a most enormous outrage on the honor of our Government, the cause of liberty and free soil, and the rights and interests of their own section, were devising ways and means to defeat it. They were holding public meetings, passing resolutions, and circulating petitions to Congress, containing sentiments of the utmost abhorrence to the proposed scheme. And what was the Hon. Martin Van Buren doing about those days—who, according to Mr. Adams, arrived at a point in the Texas business "beyond which he would not go!!" Let the letter to Mr. J. D. Kellogg answer. All further opposition, he tells his friends, "IS UNWISE AND INEXPEDIENT;" and not only so, but acquiescence "IS A SOLEMN DUTY;" and then he adds, (anticipating that the measure would compromit the peace of the country,) that he could not "*permit himself to doubt that the* ADMINISTRATION WILL, AS IT OUGHT TO, *be supported in the prosecution of* SUCH A WAR *by the hearts and hands of the whole people.*"

About the same time, in answer to a letter of invitation to attend a ball, from Mr. Vache, he expressed similar sentiments.

In a letter to a political friend in Pennsylvania, dated no longer ago than the 20th of October, 1847, he goes the whole figure for the war. He says, we must have from Mexico, "indemnity for the past, and security for the future." The exaction of this indemnity, he pronounces a solemn duty, and "if these be not obtained," he declares "the survivors of our gallant army cannot be brought home, without impeachment of the laurels they have so nobly won; nor the memories of the heroic dead shielded from the reflection of having been sacrificed in a worse than useless contest." Will Mr. C. F. Adams tell us what sort of morality this is? No matter whether the war was just or unjust, necessary or the reverse, useful or mischevious in its objects, effects, and consequences, we must, as Mr. Van Buren insists, continue the fight on a point of honor. But this is not all. In the same letter Mr. V. B. advances the following slavish doctrine: "Whatever may hereafter be the propriety of instituting inquiries into the necessity of its (the war) occurrence, with a view to the just responsibility to public opinion of our public servants, *such an investigation* may at *this time*, and *under existing circumstances*, as well upon principles of *sound political morality*, as of *national expediency, be well regarded as out of season*," or in other words pending a war, *mum* must be the word, and not a syllable uttered against "the powers that be;" while the war lasts it must be assumed, as in the case of the despots of Europe, that the President has done and can do no wrong. He may squander the treasures of the people, and sport with their lives to any extent, and remain wholly irresponsible until (at some remote and indefinite period) the war is over; and then Mr. V. B. vouchsafes an inquiry with a view "to a just responsibility to public opinion," of those who involved us in an unnecessary and unjust war. What sort of republicanism are we to have under the auspices of the coalition, if they ever should reach place and power! Verily, if there is any point beyond which Mr. Van Buren will not go, Mr. C. F. Adams will hardly be able to discover it with a telescope.

HOW THERE WAS A PRETTY CONSIDERABLE OBSTACLE OVER WHICH CHARLES F. ADAMS, ESQ., HAD TO STUMBLE BEFORE HE ARRIVED IN THE MIDST OF THE ODDS AND ENDS OF ALL PARTIES AT BUFFALO, TO THE CONCLUSION THAT MR. VAN BUREN IS TRUSTWORTHY ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

Extract from a letter of the Hon. Martin Van Buren, dated in July last, and laid before the Utica Convention, where he was first nominated as a candidate for the Presidency at the present election:

"*The extent to which I have sustained it (slavery) in the various public stations I have occupied*, are known to the country. I was at that time aware that *I went further in this respect than my best friends could approve.* But deeply penetrated with the conviction that slavery was the only subject which could endanger our blessed Union, I was determined that no effort on my part, within the pale of the Constitution, should be wanting to sustain its compromises as they were then understood, ☞ AND IT IS A SOURCE OF CONSOLATION TO ME THAT I PURSUED THE COURSE I THEN ADOPTED. * * * Whilst the candidate of my friends for the Presidency, *I distinctly announced my opinion in favor of the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia*, although I was, for reasons which were then ☞AND STILL ARE☜ SATISFACTORY TO MY MIND, DECIDEDLY OPPOSED TO ITS EXERCISE THERE." "MARTIN VAN BUREN"

Recollect that at the very time Mr. Charles F. Adams pretends he became convinced of the rectitude of Mr. Van Buren, these sentiments remained unqualified and unrecalled! It is true that Mr. Van Buren tries to paddle out of them in his letter accepting the Buffalo nomination, but he makes bad work of it. We submit to Mr. A. that TERGIVERSATION TO BE SUCCESSFUL REQUIRES A LONG MEMORY!

HOW CHARLES F. ADAMS, ESQ., A CANDIDATE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENCY OF THE U. S., AND THE FRANK, SINCERE, HONEST, TRUTH-LOVING, PIOUS AND REV. JOSHUA LEAVITT, ARE PERFECTLY AGREED ON ONE POINT, AS TO WHICH BOTH OF THEM ARE EGREGIOUSLY MISTAKEN.

"And this letter, in my belief, then as well as now, cost him the nomination. Instead, therefore, of verifying my fear that he would be 'true to his interest only,' I found that he had done what so sagacious a statesman could not help knowing would prove, as it did prove, fatal to it. He did what Mr. Leavitt lately said of him, and what no other man in the United States has done—'laid the Presidency on the altar with his eyes open.'" So says Mr. C. F. Adams, in his letter of the 6th of September.

Here we find both Mr. Adams and the Rev. Mr. Leavitt, in substance, asserting that Mr. Van Buren wrote the Hammett letter in the full belief that it would prove fatal to his nomination; and that such was his repugnance to the annexation of Texas, and such his sense of the evils which would result from it, that he, in the manner indicated, knowingly offered up all his aspirations for the Presidency on the altar of his country. We are called on to believe that he wrote a letter, containing a long and an elaborate argument in favor of the constitutionality of annexation, and placing his objection to the expediency of the measure on temporary and fleet-

ing grounds only; in which he said it will not do now, but may, and probably will, be admissible by and by; Mexico and Texas are at war, and we should not, by absorbing the latter, make the war our own; but ere long peace may come, and that would alter the case essentially, or Mexico may be unreasonably pugnacious, and continue to struggle for her ascendancy in Texas too long, and then I may go for annexation, war or no war; in any event I shall be inclined to consult Congress, and having ever *professed* the Democratic faith, I must be supposed to have a proper deference for "the wishes of the People," which I shall carry out when "constitutionally and solemnly expressed," with not a word for liberty, free soil, or the rights and interests of the free States; that he wrote such a letter, in a spirit of self-immolation, and immediately backed it up by doing the very thing which he (according to Mr. Adams) deprecated through the agency of Mr. Polk, whose election he secured, and whose administration he has supported throughout.

But, after all, let us look a little into the circumstances. It is well known that a large majority of the delegates to the Democratic Convention in '44 were appointed to favor, if not instructed to vote for, the nomination of Mr. Van Buren; that they did so vote on several of the first ballots, and that he failed solely in consequence of the adoption of the two-thirds rule. But a considerable number of that majority were secretly in favor of other candidates, and these joined the minority, and thus carried through the rule above alluded to, it is true for the purpose of defeating Mr. Van Buren, but not by any means on account of the Hammett letter. Do Messrs. Adams and Leavitt mean to assert that this celebrated rule resulted from that letter, or was adopted in consequence of it? On the contrary, it was a discreditable artifice—a mere trap sprung on Mr. Van Buren, wholly unanticipated by him or any of his friends, by which he was made to pay a high and well merited penalty for the demagoguism of a long life; but to call it a measure of persecution, for or on account of his letter to Mr. Hammett, is absurd. In fact, at the time that letter was penned, Mr. Van Buren confidently expected a nomination—the Democratic sentiment of the country was decidedly in his favor—the resolutions of political bodies, and the appointments to the Convention, all indicated this, and a sacrifice of the Presidency was the last thing he thought of. The letter itself, drawn up with great care and with a skill and adroitness to which few men are equal, is conclusive on this point. There is just enough in it for the North, South, East, and West, to save himself every where, and under the circumstances existing at the time, it was, in our judgment, the very best letter he could have written to secure the Presidency. Recollect that in April, 1844, annexation was by no means popular in the country, and that as late as the 8th of June, 1844, the Senate rejected the Tyler treaty of annexation by a vote of 35 against it, to only 16 for it! So much for the assertion that Mr. Van Buren "laid the Presidency on the altar with his eyes open."

How the sneer of C. F. Adams, Esq., at the Whigs ("late Whig party," as he calls them,) for advocating the claims to "the Presidency of the only slaveholder in the field," is put down by the more liberal, just, and patriotic sentiments of his own venerated and much lamented father.

Washington, July 26, 1848.

Sir:—In answer to the inquiry contained in your favor of the 21st inst., I have the honor to say, that hearing from many of our friends that Hon. John Quincy Adams was in favor of General Taylor for the Presidency, I took occasion to introduce the subject of the candidacy in a conversation with him, by asking him whom the Whigs would run. His answer was, General Taylor. I expressed some dissatisfaction at such a nomination; and he replied, that he preferred him to any other Southern man; that he believed him to be the only man who could break down this corrupt Administration, and close this miserable war; and would do more to curb the spirit of conquest, and check the spread of slavery, than any man the Whigs could elect. In another conversation with him on this subject, he expressed the same general views, and said that General Taylor as a soldier was bound to obey the orders of the President, and could not as an honorable man resign his commission in time of war, when his country wanted his services. These conversations were held with Mr. Adams some time in January, as near as I can now recollect.

Very respectfully, your ob't servant,
CHARLES HUDSON.

John W. Proctor, Esq.

How also the said Adams is taught by the Hon. Joshua R. Giddings that the support of Gen. Taylor is not inconsistent with free soil principles, and anti-slavery sympathies and feelings.

In the 26th Congress, Mr. Giddings made a speech upon the causes of the Florida war. In that speech he justly criticised the conduct of the Executive (Mr. Van Buren) and Gen. Jesup. Our readers have already been apprised that Gen. Taylor, then in Florida, refused to execute the orders of the Government in catching runaway slaves. Mr. Giddings, when treating upon the subject, said: "I will now call the attention of this Committee to that portion of General Jesup's order which fastens upon the people of this nation the character of slaveholders and the purchasers of slaves; by which this nation, boasting of its liberty and its regard for equal rights, became a 'dealer in human flesh.' I refer to that portion of the order which declares the slaves to be 'taken on account of the Government, and held subject to the order of the Secretary of War.' On the 24th of September, 1837, Gen. Jesup wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs saying "the Seminole negroes are now all the property of the public. I have promised Abraham the freedom of his family, if he prove faithful to us; and I shall certainly hang him if he be not faithful."

"Mr. Chairman, I think the people of my district will be slow to admit that Gen. Jesup possessed the constitutional power or right to make them slaveholders. Some of them I am sure will disclaim all title to these slaves, and, LIKE GEN. TAYLOR, *will refuse to have any concern or connection with this transaction.*" Appendix to the Congressional Globe; 2d Session, 26th Congress, p. 350.

Here Mr. Giddings admits that the conduct of Gen. Taylor, on a subject nearly touching southern rights, was exactly what his patriotic and intelligent constituents would approve, and, if placed in

the same circumstances, imitate; and that our readers may appreciate that conduct properly, we subjoin the following Rough and Ready letter:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF THE SOUTH,
Tampa, (Florida) June 2, 1838.

General: I have the honor to acknowlege your communication of the 10th of May, 1838, accompanied by one of the 9th from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, addressed to Capt. Cooper, acting Secretary of War, on the subject of turning over certain negroes captured by the Creek warriors in Florida to a Mr. Collins, their agent, in compliance with an engagement of Gen. Jesup.

I know nothing of the negroes in question, nor of the subject, farther than what is contained in the communication above referred to; but I must state distinctly for the information of all concerned, that while I shall hold myself ever ready to do all in my power to get the Indians and their negroes out of Florida, as well as to remove them to their new homes west of the Mississippi, I cannot for a moment consent to meddle in this transaction, or to be concerned, for the benefit of Mr. Collins, the Creek Indians, or any one else; or to interfere in any way between the Indians and their negroes, which may have a tendency to deprive the former of their property, *and reduce the latter from a comparative state of freedom to that of slavery;* at the same time I shall take every means to obtain and restore to his lawful owner any slave among the Indians who has absconded or been captured by them.

Very respectfully, I have the honor to be,
General, your obedient servant,
Z. TAYLOR.
Brevet Brig. U. S. Army Commanding.

Gen. R. JONES, Adjt. Gen. U. S. Army, Washington, D. C.

HOW ODDLY THE TWO CATTLE TEAM WORKS WHICH WAS YOKED UP SO MARVELOUSLY AT BUFFALO BY THE REV. JOSHUA LEAVITT AND OTHERS.

The Mexican War. "It is due to the future fame, as well as the present prosperity of this great nation, that it be triumphantly sustained."—*Martin Van Buren.*

The Mexican War. "The present war with Mexico is unconstitutional in its origin, unjust in its character, and detestable in its objects."—*Charles F. Adams.*

HOW MR. C. F. ADAMS IS NOW ASSOCIATING POLITICALLY WITH A MAN WHO CAME VERY NEAR LOSING HIS HEAD.

The following is the illegal, unconstitutional, and wicked order issued by Martin Van Buren, in the Amistad case:

"The Marshal of the United States for the District of Connecticut will deliver over to John S. Payne, of the United States Navy, and aid in conveying on board the schooner Grampus, under his command, all the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner Amistad, in his custody, under process now pending before the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut. For so doing this order is his warrant.

"Given under my hand at the city of Washington, this 7th day of January, A. D. 1840.

"M. VAN BUREN.

"By the President, JOHN FORSYTH, Secretary of State."

The following are the indignant comments of the old man eloquent, (J. Q. Adams,) on the atrocious conduct of Mr. Van Buren in the premises; being extracts from his arguments before the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Amistad case:

"Lawless and tyrannical: (may it please the Court—truth, justice, and the rights of human kind forbid me to qualify these epithets,) lawless and tyrannical, as this order thus was, on its face, the cold blooded cruelty with which it was issued, was altogether congenial to its spirit. I have said that it was issued in the dead of the winter—and that the Grampus was of so small a burthen as to be utterly unfit for the service upon which she was ordered. I now add that the gallant officer who commanded her remonstrated, with feelings of indignation controlled only by the respect officially due from him to his superiors against it. That he warned them of the impossibility of stowing this cargo of human flesh and blood beneath the deck of the vessel, and that if they should be shipped in the month of January, on her deck, and the almost certain casualty of a storm should befall them on the passage to Cuba, they must all inevitably perish. He remonstrated in vain."

In course of the same argument, Mr. Adams further remarked:

"This order (to take the negroes) was on its face positive, sweeping, unconstitutional. No specification of persons, no names, not even their number; *all* the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner Amistad, in his custody, under process *now pending* before the Circuit Court of the United States. *Was this order given in a country where the rights of persons are words without meaning? In the kingdom of Dahomey? In the region where the bowstring is the warrant of execution? It was given in the land of the Declaration of Independence—in the land of the self-evident truth—it was given by a President of the United States!* IT WAS OF COURSE NULL AND VOID; AND IF, BEFORE THE DECISION OF THE COURT, IT HAD BEEN DELIVERED TO THE MARSHAL, AND HE HAD EXECUTED IT, HE WOULD HAVE STAKED NOT ONLY THE LIVES OF THE NEGROES, BUT HIS OWN HEAD, AND THAT OF MARTIN VAN BUREN, THE SIGNER OF THE ORDER, UPON THE EVENT."

Thus we present Mr. C. F. Adams to the public, on the platform which he truly occupies, and there we leave him in the full gaze of the American people. Whether his position be consistent, just, and proper, and whether it be such as becomes a high-minded, honorable, and upright man, it will not be difficult for our sagacious countrymen to determine. Mr. Adams may rely upon it that consistency and steadiness in political men is quite indispensable to public confidence; and that the espousal by Mr. Van Buren of the rights and interests of the free States, after a long life of abject submission to the South, and the conviction of the trustworthiness of Mr. Van Buren, which, in such a mysterious manner, seized his (Mr. A's) mind at the Buffalo Convention, were both a little too sudden to command the respect of those who believe that virtue and vice do not come and go in paroxysms—that every man must be "judged by his preceding course taken as a whole"—and thus regarding the life, conduct, and actions of Mr. Van Buren, it would appear that no man could "delude himself into the belief that he is fixed to any thing but his own interest;" or Mr. C. F. Adams, (taking a similar view of his course,) to any thing but the indulgence of feelings so intolerant, views so narrow and biggoted, prejudices so deep seated, resentments so inexorable, and passions so turbulent, as to render political co-operation with him on the part of the just, generous, and wise, utterly impossible. Verily, he is a befitting associate of such a man as Martin Van Buren.